IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

FRIDAY, THE 30TH MARCH 2007 / 9TH CHAITHRA 1929

WP(C).No. 11248 of 2007(L)

PETITIONER:

DR.P.R.HAREENDRA SARMA, AGED 35,
S/O.LATE P.P.RAMDAS SHARMA, PUTHENVEEDU, NEAR
GOVT.U.P.SCHOOL CHIRAKKAKAM SOUTH, VARAPUZHA,
KOCHI, NOW WORKING AS A HINDI TRANSLATOR IN
COCONUT DEVELOPMENT BOARD, KOCHI.

BY ADV. SRI.B.M.AJITH
SRI.P.E.THOMAS

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. COCONUT DEVELOPMENT BOARD, REPRESENTED
BY ITS CHAIRMAN, S.R.V.H.S.SCHOOL ROAD,
KOCHI - 682 011, KERALA.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF GENERAL OF DOORDARSHAN,
DIRECTORATE OF DOORADARSHAN, S II A,
SECTION, DOORADARSHA BHAVAN, COPPER NICUS MARG,
NEW DELHI - 1.

3. DIRECTOR OF DOORDARSHAN, DOORDARSHAN
KENDRA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

4. UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY
SECRETARY, INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING
MINISTRY, NEW DELHI.

R2 & 3 BY SC SHRI. S. SUJIN
R4 BY ASST. SOL. GENERAL SHRI. JOHN VARGHESE

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 30/3/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K.DENESAN, J.

WP(C).No. 11248 OF 2007 L

Dated this the 30th March, 2007.

JUDGMENT

This writ petition has been filed by a person who is working on deputation in the service of the first respondent. His grievance is against Ext.P2 by which the first respondent has decided to see that the services of the petitioner are no more required in the first respondent-Board and that he shall render the service in the parent department with effect from 1.4.2007. Counsel for the petitioner submits that a representation has been filed before the parent department requesting to permit the petitioner to continue on deputation in the services of the first respondent. But copy of the said representation has not been produced along with this writ petition. It is not understood whether the said representation has been received, considered, allowed or rejected by the respondent.

2. The petitioner has no indefeasbile right to continue to work in an institution. Such service is known as foreign service. The petitioner has the right to continue to serve the parent department as per the Rules and if the foreign department feels that his service is no

more required, it is not proper to impose on that foreign department the service of the petitioner. Writ petition is devoid of merits. Dismissed.

K.K.DENESAN
Judge

jj